arXiv:1403.6218v1 [math.AG] 25 Mar 2014

EQUIVARIANT QUANTUM COHOMOLOGY OF THE GRASSMANNIAN VIA THE RIM HOOK RULE

ELIZABETH BEAZLEY, ANNA BERTIGER, AND KAISA TAIPALE

ABSTRACT. A driving question in (quantum) cohomology of flag varieties is to find non-recursive, positive combinatorial formulas for expressing the product of two classes in a particularly nice basis, called the Schubert basis. Bertram, Ciocan-Fontanine and Fulton provided a way to compute quantum products of Schubert classes in the Grassmannian of k-planes in complex n-space by doing classical multiplication and then applying a combinatorial rim hook rule which yields the quantum parameter. In this paper, we provide a generalization of this rim hook rule to the setting in which there is also an action of the complex torus. Combining this result with Knutson and Tao's puzzle rule then gives an effective algorithm for computing the equivariant quantum Littlewood-Richardson coefficients. Interestingly, this rule requires a specialization of torus weights modulo n, providing an explicit connection to the Peterson isomorphism relating quantum and affine Schubert calculus.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction 2
1.1. Statement of the Main Theorem 2
1.2. Applications and Directions for Future Work 3
1.3. Organization of the Paper 4
1.4. Acknowledgements 4
2. The Equivariant Rim Hook Rule 4
2.1. The Grassmannian and Factorial Schur Polynomials 4
2.2. The Rim Hook Rule 5
2.3. The Equivariant Generalization 6
3. Equivariant Littlewood-Richardson Coefficients 8
3.1. The Equivariant Quantum Pieri Rule 8
3.2. One Box Associativity 9
4. Abacus Diagrams and Core Partitions 11
4.1. Abacus Diagrams, Partitions, and n-cores 11
4.2. Coefficients in Equivariant Cohomology and n-cores 12
5. Cyclic Factorial Schur Polynomials 14
5.1. Polynomial Presentations for Equivariant Cohomology 14
5.2. Direct Analog of the Rim Hook Rule 16
5.3. Jacobi-Trudi Formulas and Cyclic Factorial Schur Polynomials 17
6. Identities on Equivariant Littlewood-Richardson Coefficients 21
References 24

Date: March 26, 2014.
Key words and phrases. Schubert calculus, equivariant quantum cohomology, core partition, abacus diagram, factorial Schur polynomial.

1. INTRODUCTION

Quantum cohomology grew out of string theory in the early 1990s. Physicists Candelas, de la Ossa, Green, and Parkes proposed a partial answer to the Clemens conjecture regarding the number of rational curves of given degree on a general quintic threefold, and this brought enormous attention to the mathematical ideas being used by string theorists. A rigorous formulation of (small) quantum cohomology as the deformation of cohomology in which the structure constants naively count curves satisfying certain incidence conditions was soon developed and extended to a wide class of algebraic varieties and symplectic manifolds [FP]. In the mid-1990s Givental proved the conjecture proposed by physicists counting the number of rational curves of given degree on a general quintic threefold [Giv]. Simultaneously, Givental and Kim introduced equivariant Gromov-Witten invariants and the equivariant quantum cohomology ring [GK1].

When studying the special case of the Grassmannian of k-dimensional subspaces of $\mathbb{C}^n$, the four variants of generalized cohomology discussed here (classical cohomology, quantum cohomology, equivariant cohomology and quantum equivariant cohomology), miraculously *all* have a basis of Schubert classes indexed by partitions with at most k parts each of size at most $n-k$. There are beautiful combinatorial Littlewood-Richardson rules for computing the structure constants in products of this favored basis in classical cohomology. These Littlewood-Richardson coefficients are known to be non-negative integers, and there is an analog of this positivity result in each of the other three contexts. Since the structure constants for (small) quantum cohomology are enumerative, counting the number of stable maps from rational curves to $Gr(k,n)$ with three marked points mapping into three specified Schubert varieties, they are clearly positive. Graham proved an analog of classical positivity in the equivariant case [Gra], and Mihalcea proved an analogue for equivariant quantum Littlewood-Richardson coefficients [Mih1].

In addition to nice combinatorial properties, there is an analog of the ring presentation for $H^*(Gr(k,n))$ in terms of Schur polynomials in each of these more general contexts. For an overview of the Schur presentation in the classical case, we refer the reader to Fulton's book and the references therein [Ful]. The equivariant presentation is also established via the Borel isomorphism, but with the additional perspective of GKM theory as in [KT]. Bertram proved a quantum analogue of the Giambelli and Pieri formulas for the quantum cohomology ring of the Grassmannian [Ber], while the equivariant quantum ring presentation was given by Mihalcea [Mih2]. In that paper, Mihalcea proves a Giambelli formula which shows that the factorial Schur polynomials of [MS] represent the equivariant quantum Schubert classes.

1.1. Statement of the Main Theorem.

In [BCFF], Bertram, Ciocan-Fontanine, and Fulton proved a delightful rule for computing the structure constants in the quantum cohomology of $Gr(k,n)$ from the structure constants of the classical cohomology ring of $Gr(k,2n)$. More specifically, they provide an explicit formula for the quantum version of the Littlewood-Richardson coefficients as signed summations of the classical Littlewood-Richardson coefficients $c^{\nu}_{\lambda,\mu}$ that appear in the expansion of a product of Schubert classes in terms of the Schubert basis. The algorithm involves removing *rim hooks* from the border strip of the Young diagram for ν in exchange for picking up signed powers of the quantum variable q, and thus became known as the *rim hook rule*.

Prior to the work presented in this paper, all known algorithms for computing equivariant quantum Littlewood-Richardson coefficients were either recursive or rely on doing computations in a related two-step flag variety. Mihalcea gave the first algorithm for calculating equivariant quantum Littlewood-Richardson coefficients in the form of a (non-positive) recursion in [Mih1]. An extension of the puzzle rule of Knutson and Tao [KT] to two-step flag varieties has been proved in [BKPT], and Buch has announced an extension of this two-step puzzle rule to the equivariant case [Buc]. In principle this two-step puzzle rule can be combined with results of [BKT] to produce quantum Littlewood-Richardson coefficients by computing Schubert structure constants in as many as $n/2$ different two-step flag varieties. While this paper was in preparation, the authors

discovered that Gorbounov and Korff have also recently established a different non-recursive formula for the equivariant quantum Littlewood-Richardson coefficients that does not appeal to two-step flags [GK2].

The main theorem in this paper is an equivariant generalization of the rim hook rule in [BCFF]. In contrast to the pre-existing methods for computing equivariant quantum Littlewood-Richardson coefficients, the method presented in this paper is not recursive and does not rely on related calculations in a two-step flag variety. In particular, this *equivariant rim hook rule* is much more computationally efficient, and can be used together with any method of computing equivariant Littlewood-Richardson coefficients, including the Knutson-Tao puzzle package for the computer program Sage [S^+]. The following is an informal statement of Theorem 2.4 in the body of this paper.

Theorem 1.1. *The equivariant quantum product of two Schubert classes $\sigma_\lambda \star \sigma_\mu$ in $QH^*_T(Gr(k,n))$ can be computed by computing the equivariant product of corresponding classes in $H^*_T(Gr(k,2n-1))$ and then reducing in a suitable way. This reduction involves both rim hook removal and a specialization of the torus weights modulo n.*

Here the choice of lifting classes to $Gr(k,2n-1)$ is actually quite deliberate, made for reasons of computational convenience in the proof. This is discussed in Remark 2.3.

To prove this theorem we show that the product defined by this lift and reduction is both associative and coincides with equivariant quantum Chevalley-Monk formula for multiplying by the class corresponding to a single box. Mihalcea's Theorem 3.1 says that these two conditions suffice to yield a ring isomorphic to $QH^*_T(Gr(k,n))$. The proof of the equivariant quantum Chevalley-Monk rule is straightforward; the real difficulty lies in proving the associativity statement. There are two key combinatorial ingredients in the proof of associativity. The first tool is the abacus model for Young diagrams, which we use to understand the reduction modulo n on the torus weights in Section 4. In addition, in Section 5 we develop a modification of factorial Schur polynomials, which we call *cyclic factorial Schur polynomials*, in order to relate the classical product in $H^*_T(Gr(k,2n-1))$ to the quantum product in $QH^*_T(Gr(k,n))$.

1.2. **Applications and Directions for Future Work.** A stunning result of Peterson published by Lam and Shimozono [LS1] proves that quantum equivariant cohomology of any partial flag variety G/P is a quotient of the equivariant homology of the affine Grassmannian. Peterson's isomorphism says that, up to localization, there is a map

$$H^T_*(Gr_G) \twoheadrightarrow QH^*_T(Gr(k,n)).$$

The reduction of torus weights modulo n in the main theorem of this paper also appears in the context of Lam and Shimozono's work relating double quantum Schubert polynomials to k-double Schur polynomials [LS2]. It is the expectation of the authors that cyclic factorial Schur polynomials are the image of the k-double Schur polynomials, which are known to represent equivariant homology classes of the affine Grassmannian, under the Peterson isomorphism [LS3]. This connection suggests that the equivariant rim hook rule is a shadow of Peterson's isomorphism and can shed further light on what has become known as the "quantum equals affine" phenomenon, and the authors intend to explore this in a future paper.

Horn's problem gives a way to relate Gromov-Witten invariants to the spectra of two Hermitian matrices and the spectrum of their sum [Hor]. Presently there are solutions to both quantum and equivariant analogs of Horn's problem. Further, work of Agnihotri and Woodward [AW], improved by Belkale in [Bel], proves a saturation result for the fusion coefficients for the Verlinde algebra of $SU_n(\mathbb{C})$. It would be fascinating to interpret the equivariant rim hook rule as a variation on Horn's problem, in which case these Gromov-Witten invariants carry information about certain fusion coefficients in an equivariant generalization of the Verlinde algebra. The Verlinde algebra is obtained from quantum cohomology of the Grassmannian by specializing the quantum parameter

to $q = 1$. This can be done formally for the equivariant quantum cohomology ring; the interesting question would then be to understand which representation-theoretic problems are answered by studying the equivariant Verlinde algebra.

Gorbounov and Korff [GK2] have recently posted a paper to the arXiv taking an integrable systems approach to equivariant quantum cohomology of the Grassmannian, including an explicit determinantal formula for the equivariant quantum Littlewood-Richardson coefficients. It appears to match our formula and illuminates another aspect of the connection between these non-recursive rules for equivariant quantum Littlewood-Richardson coefficients and integrable systems. Gorbounov and Korff prove that these vicious and osculating walkers have a concrete representation in the affine nil-Hecke ring, which plays a key role in the proof of Peterson's isomorphism in [LS1].

1.3. **Organization of the Paper.** We begin with a brief review of Schubert calculus on the Grassmannian, with particular emphasis on the equivariant and quantum cohomologies and their polynomial representatives. In Section 2, we discuss the rim hook rule of [BCFF], and then provide a precise statement of the equivariant generalization, which is the main result of the paper. The proof of Theorem 2.4 is contained in Section 3, although we postpone the proofs of two key propositions required for associativity in order not to interrupt the flow of the exposition. Abacus diagrams, which are the first of two important tools for proving associativity, are introduced in Section 4. Cyclic factorial Schur polynomials are then defined in Section 5. We close in Section 6 with a collection of identities on equivariant quantum Littlewood-Richardson coefficients which arise as consequences of the equivariant rim hook rule.

1.4. **Acknowledgements.** Part of the work for this paper was completed during the semester program on "Multiple Dirichlet Series, Combinatorial Representation Theory, and Multiple Dirichlet Series" at the Institute for Computational and Experimental Research in Mathematics in the spring of 2013. The authors are very grateful for the financial support and excellent working conditions at ICERM. The last author also thanks Cornell University and the Mathematical Sciences Research Institute (MSRI). In addition, several important aspects of the work were tested and implemented using the computer package Sage. Thanks to those who wrote the Knutson-Tao puzzles package during Sage Days 45, most notably Franco Saliola, Anne Schilling, Ed Richmond, and Avinash Dalal, in discussions with Allen Knutson.

2. The Equivariant Rim Hook Rule

2.1. **The Grassmannian and Factorial Schur Polynomials.** The Grassmannian $Gr(k,n)$ is the complex variety whose points are k-planes in $\mathbb{C}^n$. In this paper, we are interested in the equivariant quantum cohomology of the Grassmannian. We'll start by introducing cohomology.

The cohomology of the Grassmannian is governed by the intersection theory of Schubert varieties. A Schubert variety X_λ is a subvariety of $Gr(k,n)$ satisfying the condition:

$$X_\lambda := \{V \in Gr(k,n) : \dim(V \cap \mathbb{C}^{n-k-\lambda_i+i}) \geq i \ \forall \ i\}.$$

The Schubert varieties of $Gr(k,n)$ are indexed by partitions $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n)$ with $n-k \geq \lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \ldots \geq \lambda_k \geq 0$. We denote the set of such partitions by $\mathcal{P}_{kn}$. We visualize partitions λ as **Young diagrams** of k rows with λ_i boxes in the i^{th} row, counting the top row as the first row (this is the English convention). A **semi-standard Young tableaux (SSYT) of shape** λ is a filling of the boxes in the Young diagram with the numbers 1 to k, one number per box, such that the numbers are weakly increasing in rows proceeding left to right and strictly increasing in columns proceeding top to bottom. Moreover, there is an isomorphism between $H^*(Gr(k,n))$ and the ring of Schur

polynomials in variables $x_1, \ldots, x_k$:

$$H^*(Gr(k,n)) \cong \mathbb{Z}[e_1, \ldots, e_k]/\langle h_{n-k+1}, \ldots, h_n \rangle \tag{2.1}$$

$$\sigma_\lambda \mapsto s_\lambda. \tag{2.2}$$

Here s_λ are the **Schur polynomials** in $x_1, \ldots, x_k$

$$s_\lambda = \sum_T \prod_{\alpha \in T} x_{T(b)}$$

where the T are all of the semi-standard fillings of shape λ by the numbers 1 through k, and the product is over all boxes in the SSYT. The number $T(\alpha)$ is the filling of the box α. The e_i are elementary symmetric polynomials in $x_1, \ldots, x_k$, which can be thought of as $s_{(1)^i}$, the h_i are homogeneous symmetric polynomials, $s_{(i)}$.

There is a natural $(\mathbb{C}^*)^n$-action on $Gr(k,n)$. Let $T_n \cong (\mathbb{C}^*)^n$ act on $Gr(k,n)$ with weight t_i on the ith coordinate of $\mathbb{C}^n$. The T_n-equivariant cohomology ring $H^*_{T_n}(Gr(k,n))$ is an algebra over $\Lambda = \mathbb{Z}[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$. As a Λ-module, $H_{T_n}(Gr(k,n))$ again has an additive basis give by $\{\sigma_\lambda\}$ indexed by $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{kn}$. Set the following definition and choice of convention for the factorial Schur polynomial $s_\lambda(x|t)$ corresponding to a Schubert class σ_λ:

Definition 2.1. The **factorial Schur polynomial** $s_\lambda(x|t)$ corresponding to $\sigma_\lambda \in H^*_T(Gr(k,n))$ is

$$s_\lambda(x|t) = \sum_T \prod_{\alpha \in T} (x_{T(\alpha)} - t_{T(\alpha)+c(\alpha)}).$$

The sum is again over all SSYT of shape λ by the numbers 1 through k, and the product is over boxes α in T. Again $T(\alpha)$ gives the filling of α in T, and $c(\alpha) = j - i$ when α is the box in the j^{th} column and i^{th} row.

We again specially call out the factorial elementary symmetric functions, $e_i(x|t) = s_{(1)^i}(x|t)$, and the factorial homogeneous complete symmetric functions $h_i(x|t) = s_{(i)}(x|t)$. Notice that if all $t_i = 0$, then the polynomial $s_\lambda(x|t)$ specializes to $s_\lambda(x)$. Here we again have an isomorphism between $H^*_T(Gr(k,n))$ and the ring of factorial Schur polynomials:

$$H^*_{T_n}(Gr(k,n)) \cong \mathbb{Z}[e_1(x|t), \ldots, e_k(x|t)]/\langle h_{n-k+1}(x|t), \ldots, h_n(x|t) \rangle \tag{2.3}$$

$$\sigma_\lambda \mapsto s_\lambda(x|t). \tag{2.4}$$

In [Mih1], Mihalcea proves that the T_n-equivariant quantum cohomology ring $QH^*_{T_n}(Gr(k,n))$ of the Grassmannian $Gr(k,n)$ is isomorphic to the quotient ring:

$$QH^*_{T_n}(Gr(k,n)) \cong \Lambda[q, e_1(x|t), \ldots, e_k(x|t)]/\langle h_{n-k+1}(x|t), \ldots, h_{n-1}(x|t), h_n(x|t) + (-1)^k q \rangle, \tag{2.5}$$

where Λ is again the ring $\mathbb{Z}[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$ of polynomials in the torus weights t_i. In this case we realize the $s_\lambda(x|t)$ as elements of the ring using the **Jacobi-Trudi formula**:

$$s_\lambda = \det\left(h_{\lambda_i + j - i}\right)_{1 \le i,j \le k}.$$

2.2. **The Rim Hook Rule.** In [BCFF], Bertram, Ciocan-Fontanine, and Fulton established a delightful rule presenting quantum Littlewood-Richardson coefficients as signed sums of classical Littlewood-Richardson coefficients. The rim hook algorithm as phrased in [BCFF] does not use the language of lifting Schubert classes, rather carrying out multiplication in the ring of Schur polynomials in the variables $x_1, \ldots, x_k$. We rephrase [BCFF]'s main lemma below to draw the most natural parallel to our result. Choose the identity map to lift classes in $H^*(Gr(k,n))$ to $H^*(Gr(k,2n-1))$ and denote this lift of σ_λ by $\widehat{\sigma_\lambda}$.

Define $\varphi : H^*(Gr(k,2n-1)) \to QH^*(Gr(k,n))$ to be the $\mathbb{Z}$-module homomorphism generated by

$$\sigma_\gamma \longmapsto \begin{cases} \prod_{i=1}^{d} \left((-1)^{(\varepsilon_i - k)} q\right) \sigma_\nu & \text{if } \nu \in \mathcal{P}_{kn}, \\ 0 & \text{if } \nu \notin \mathcal{P}_{kn}, \end{cases} \tag{2.6}$$

where d is the number of n-rim hooks removed, ε_i is the height of the i^{th} rim hook removed, and ν is the n-core of γ. Then the theorem below follows from [BCFF]:

Theorem 2.2. *Consider $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{P}_{kn}$, and write $\widehat{\sigma_\lambda} \cdot \widehat{\sigma_\mu} = \sum c^\gamma_{\lambda,\mu} \sigma_\gamma$ in $H^*(Gr(k,2n-1))$. Then,*

$$\sigma_\lambda \star \sigma_\mu = \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_{k,2n-1}} c^\gamma_{\lambda,\mu} \varphi(\sigma_\gamma) \in QH^*(Gr(k,n)). \tag{2.7}$$

Remark 2.3. We remark that the choice of lifting to $H^*(Gr(k,2n-1))$ is quite deliberate. If instead the lift were to the instinctive choice $H^*(Gr(k,2n))$, the reduction map from $H^*(Gr(k,2n))$ to $QH^*(Gr(k,n))$ would require that $h_{2n} \equiv 0 \in H^*(Gr(k,2n))$ map to $q^2 \in QH^*(Gr(k,n))$, but $q^2 \neq 0 \mod J$.

2.3. **The Equivariant Generalization.** Our theorem generalizes this rim hook rule of [BCFF] to the context in which there is also an action of the torus $T_n = (\mathbb{C}^*)^n$. The equivariant cohomology ring $H^*_{T_n}(Gr(k,n))$ also has a Schubert basis indexed by Young diagrams, and (using the conventions adopted in this paper) the equivariant Littlewood-Richardson coefficients are homogeneous polynomials in non-negative sums of polynomials from $\Lambda = \mathbb{Z}[t_2 - t_1, \ldots, t_n - t_{n-1}]$. There are combinatorial formulas for explicitly computing the expansions

$$\sigma_\lambda \cdot \sigma_\mu = \sum_\nu c^\nu_{\lambda,\mu} \sigma_\nu \in H^*_{T_n}(Gr(k,n)), \tag{2.8}$$

where now each of the cofficients $c^\nu_{\lambda,\mu}$ is a homogeneous polynomial in Λ. Perhaps the most famous of these is the **equivariant puzzle rule** of Knutson and Tao [KT], illustrated in Figure 2.1. The three puzzles shown correspond to the three terms, respectively, in the following product:

$$\sigma_{\square\square} \cdot \sigma_{\square\square} = \sigma_{\begin{smallmatrix}\square\square\\\square\end{smallmatrix}} + (t_4 - t_3)\sigma_{\begin{smallmatrix}\square\\\square\end{smallmatrix}} + (t_4 - t_3)(t_4 - t_2)\sigma_{\square\square}.$$

Note that our conventions on the indices for the torus weights are the reverse of those of Knutson and Tao.



FIGURE 2.1. Puzzles for computing products in $H^*_T(Gr(2,4))$

We will again denote the lift of σ_λ from $H^*_{T_n}(Gr(k,n))$ to $H^*_{T_{2n-1}}(Gr(k,2n-1))$ by $\widehat{\sigma_\lambda}$, and it will again be the identity map. In algebraic terms we can define this lift using factorial Schur polynomials. Namely, the lift $\widehat{\sigma_\lambda} \in H^*_{T_{2n-1}}(Gr(k,2n-1))$ of $\sigma_\lambda \in H^*_{T_n}(Gr(k,n))$ corresponds exactly to the factorial Schur polynomial $s_\lambda(x|t)$ in $H^*_{T_{2n-1}}(Gr(k,2n-1))$. By construction and our

choice of conventions for the torus weights, if $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{kn}$ then none of the weights $t_{n+1}, \ldots, t_{2n-1}$ appear in the factorial Schur $s_\lambda(x|t)$ in either $H^*_{T_n}(Gr(k,n))$ or $H^*_{T_{2n-1}}(Gr(k,2n-1))$, which means that our lift is well-defined.

We will now extend the map $\varphi : H^*(Gr(k,2n-1)) \to QH^*(Gr(k,n))$ to a map on equivariant cohomology

$$\varphi : H^*_{T_{2n-1}}(Gr(k,2n-1)) \longrightarrow QH^*_{T_n}(Gr(k,n)).$$

In the equivariant case, the structure constants in $H^*_{T_{2n-1}}(Gr(k,2n-1)$ are polynomials in $t_1, \ldots t_{2n-1}$ and in $QH^*_{T_n}(Gr(kn))$ the structure constants are polynomials in only $t_1, \ldots t_n$, so we cannot merely use the identity map on the structure constants; instead, we use the map $t_i \mapsto t_{i(\text{mod } n)}$. Define the reduction map φ by

$$t_i \longmapsto t_{i(\text{mod } n)} \tag{2.9}$$

$$\sigma_\gamma \longmapsto \begin{cases} \prod_{i=1}^{d} \left((-1)^{(\varepsilon_i - k)} q\right) \sigma_\nu & \text{if } \nu \in \mathcal{P}_{kn}, \\ 0 & \text{if } \nu \notin \mathcal{P}_{kn}, \end{cases} \tag{2.10}$$

Here, we take the representatives of the congruence classes mod n to be $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. Notice this map is the same as the non-equivariant version except that we now act on the torus weights which appear in the structure constants as well.

Theorem 2.4. *Let* $T_n = (\mathbb{C}^*)^n$ *and* $T_{2n-1} = (\mathbb{C}^*)^{2n-1}$. *Consider* $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{P}_{kn}$, *and the product expansion* $\widehat{\sigma_\lambda} \cdot \widehat{\sigma_\mu} = \sum c^\gamma_{\lambda,\mu} \sigma_\gamma$ *in* $H^*_{T_{2n-1}}(Gr(k,2n-1))$. *Then,*

$$\sigma_\lambda \star \sigma_\mu = \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_{k,2n-1}} \varphi\left(c^\gamma_{\lambda,\mu}\right) \varphi(\sigma_\gamma) \in QH^*_{T_n}(Gr(k,n)). \tag{2.11}$$

In Section 5, we also provide an algebraic interpretation of Theorem 2.4 and the map φ in terms of corresponding rings of factorial Schur polynomials, including providing a direct equivariant analog of the original statement from [BCFF] in Proposition 5.2.

Example 2.5. We now provide an example which illustrates how to use this theorem to compute quantum equivariant Littlewood-Richardson coefficients in $QH^*_T(Gr(2,4))$. The computations in equivariant cohomology to provide these examples were done using the Knutson-Tao puzzles package in Sage [S$^+$].

To compute $\sigma_{\square\square} \star \sigma_{\square\square} \in QH^*_T(Gr(2,4))$, we first lift the classes to $H^*_T(Gr(2,6))$ via the identity map. We then use Knutson and Tao's equivariant puzzle method to compute this product in $H^*_T(Gr(2,6))$:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\sigma_{\square\square}} \cdot \widehat{\sigma_{\square\square}} = (t_4 - t_3)(t_4 - t_2)\sigma_{\square\square} + (t_4 - t_3)\sigma_{\begin{smallmatrix}\square\\\square\end{smallmatrix}} + \sigma_{\begin{smallmatrix}\square\square\\\square\square\end{smallmatrix}} \\ + (t_5 + t_4 - t_3 - t_2)\sigma_{\square\square\square} + \sigma_{\begin{smallmatrix}\square\\\square\end{smallmatrix}\square} + \sigma_{\square\square\square\square}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

The map φ on torus weights takes $t_i \mapsto t_{i(\text{mod}4)}$, so that $t_5 \mapsto t_1$ while the rest of the torus weights are unchanged. Now, φ acts as the identity on $\sigma_{\square\square}$, $\sigma_{\begin{smallmatrix}\square\\\square\end{smallmatrix}}$, and $\sigma_{\begin{smallmatrix}\square\square\\\square\square\end{smallmatrix}}$, since all three of these Young diagrams already fit into a 2×2 box. On the other hand, $\sigma_{\square\square\square} \mapsto 0$, since this Young diagram neither fits into a 2×2 box nor contains any removable 4-rim hooks. Finally, our rim hook rule says that

$$\sigma_{\begin{smallmatrix}\square\square\\\square\end{smallmatrix}} \mapsto (-1)^{2-2} q = q \qquad \text{and} \qquad \sigma_{\square\square\square\square} \mapsto (-1)^{1-2} q = -q. \tag{2.13}$$

Altogether, Theorem 2.4 says that in $QH^*_T(Gr(2,4))$,

$$\sigma_{\square\square} \star \sigma_{\square\square} = (t_4 - t_3)(t_4 - t_2)\sigma_{\square\square} + (t_4 - t_3)\sigma_{\begin{smallmatrix}\square\\\square\end{smallmatrix}} + \sigma_{\begin{smallmatrix}\square\square\\\square\square\end{smallmatrix}} + 0 + q - q \tag{2.14}$$

$$= (t_4 - t_3)(t_4 - t_2)\sigma_{\square\square} + (t_4 - t_3)\sigma_{\begin{smallmatrix}\square\\\square\end{smallmatrix}} + \sigma_{\begin{smallmatrix}\square\square\\\square\square\end{smallmatrix}}. \tag{2.15}$$

3. Equivariant Littlewood-Richardson Coefficients

We prove Theorem 2.4 using the following result of [Mih1].

Theorem 3.1 ([Mih1]). *Let $\Lambda = \mathbb{Z}[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$. Suppose that $(A, \diamond)$ is a graded, commutative $\Lambda[q]$-algebra with unit satisfying the following three properties:*

(a) *A has an additive $\Lambda[q]$-basis $\{A_\lambda \mid \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{kn}\}$.*

(b) *The equivariant quantum Pieri rule holds; i.e.*

$$A_\square \diamond A_\lambda = \sum_{\mu \to \lambda} A_\mu + c^\lambda_{\lambda,\square} A_\lambda + q A_{\lambda^-}, \tag{3.1}$$

where $\mu \to \lambda$ denotes a covering relation in $\mathcal{P}_{kn}$, and we define

$$c^\lambda_{\lambda,\square} = \sum_{i \in U(\lambda)} t_i - \sum_{j=1}^{k} t_j, \tag{3.2}$$

where $U(\lambda)$ indexes the upward steps in the partition λ, recorded from southwest to northeast. Here, A_{λ^-} equals the basis element corresponding to λ with an $(n-1)$-rim hook removed if such a partition exists, and A_{λ^-} equals 0 if such a partition does not exist.

(c) *Multiplication by one box is associative; i.e.*

$$(A_\square \diamond A_\lambda) \diamond A_\mu = A_\square \diamond (A_\lambda \diamond A_\mu). \tag{3.3}$$

Then A is canonically isomorphic to $QH^*_T(Gr(k,n))$ as $\Lambda[q]$-algebras.

In this paper, we denote by $\circ$ our multiplication in $QH^*_{T_n}(Gr(k,n))$ carried out by lifting basis classes, which are the same as the basis classes in $H^*_{T_n}(Gr(k,n))$, to $H^*_{T_{2n-1}}(Gr(k,2n-1))$ and reducing to $QH^*_{T_n}(Gr(k,n))$. That is, for $\lambda, \sigma \in \mathcal{P}_{kn}$,

$$\sigma_\lambda \circ \sigma_\mu = \varphi(\widehat{\sigma_\lambda} \cdot \widehat{\sigma_\mu}). \tag{3.4}$$

The notation $\cdot$ will denote classical equivariant multiplication in the appropriate ring, and $\star$ will denote the quantum product. An alternative interpretation of Theorem 2.4 is that $\circ = \star$.

We will therefore be interested in the algebra A with additive basis $\{\sigma_\lambda\}$ indexed by $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{kn}$, and the operation defined by this lift-reduction map $\circ$. To prove that $(A, \circ)$ satisfies the hypotheses of Corollary 3.1, we have two primary tasks: to prove the Pieri rule and one box associativity.

3.1. The Equivariant Quantum Pieri Rule.

We begin by reviewing Mihalcea's quantum equivariant Pieri rule, and we then show that our lift and reduction map agrees with Mihalcea's formula. Denote by λ^- the Young diagram obtained by removing an $(n-1)$-rim hook from λ, with the convention that if no such rim hook exists, then $\sigma_{\lambda^-} = 0$.

Theorem 3.2 (Equivariant quantum Pieri [Mih1]). *The following Pieri formula holds in $QH^*_{T_n}(Gr(k,n))$:*

$$\sigma_\square \star \sigma_\lambda = \sum_{\substack{\mu \to \lambda \\ \mu \in \mathcal{P}_{kn}}} \sigma_\mu + c^\lambda_{\lambda,\square} \sigma_\lambda + q \sigma_{\lambda^-} \tag{3.5}$$

Proposition 3.3 (Equivariant rim hook Pieri). *For any Young diagram $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{kn}$, we have:*

$$\varphi(\widehat{\sigma_\square} \cdot \widehat{\sigma_\lambda}) = \sigma_\square \star \sigma_\lambda. \tag{3.6}$$

Proof. If $\lambda_1 \neq n - k$ then the result is immediate: we appeal to the non-quantum equivariant Pieri rule by setting $q = 0$ in Theorem 3.2 to say that

$$\varphi(\widehat{\sigma_\square} \cdot \widehat{\sigma_\lambda}) = \sum_{\substack{\mu \to \lambda \\ \mu \in \mathcal{P}_{kn}}} \sigma_\mu + c^\lambda_{\lambda,\square} \sigma_\lambda = \sigma_\square \star \sigma_\lambda. \tag{3.7}$$

If $\lambda_1 = n - k$, we denote by $\overline{\lambda}$ the Young diagram $(n-k+1) \geq \lambda_2 \geq \ldots \geq \lambda_k$ in $\mathcal{P}_{k,2n-1}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi(\widehat{\sigma_\square} \cdot \widehat{\sigma_\lambda}) &= \varphi\left(\sum_{\substack{\mu \to \lambda \\ \mu \in \mathcal{P}_{k,2n-1}}} \sigma_\mu + c^\lambda_{\lambda,\square}\widehat{\sigma_\lambda}\right) && (3.8)\\
&= \varphi\left(\sum_{\substack{\mu \to \lambda \\ \mu \in \mathcal{P}_{kn}}} \widehat{\sigma_\mu} + c^\lambda_{\lambda,\square}\widehat{\sigma_\lambda} + \sigma_{\overline{\lambda}}\right) && (3.9)\\
&= \sum_{\substack{\mu \to \lambda \\ \mu \in \mathcal{P}_{kn}}} \sigma_\mu + c^\lambda_{\lambda,\square}\sigma_\lambda + q\sigma_{\lambda^-} && (3.10)\\
&= \sigma_\square \star \sigma_\lambda && (3.11)
\end{aligned}$$

□

3.2. **One Box Associativity.** Recall that we denote by $\circ$ the composition of lifting two Schubert classes from $H^*_{T_n}(Gr(k,n))$ to $H^*_{T_{2n-1}}(Gr(k,2n-1))$, multiplying the classes, and then performing n-rim hook reduction as in Equation (3.4).

Proposition 3.4. *For any Young diagrams λ and μ in $\mathcal{P}_{kn}$, we have*

$$(\sigma_\square \circ \sigma_\lambda) \circ \sigma_\mu = \sigma_\square \circ (\sigma_\lambda \circ \sigma_\mu)\,. \tag{3.12}$$

The proof of Proposition 3.4 requires two fairly serious lemmas, which we state now and prove later in order not to interrupt the flow of the exposition.

Proposition 3.5. *Suppose that $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_{k,2n-1}$ reduces to the n-core $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_{kn}$ by removing d rim hooks. Then*

$$\sum_{\substack{\delta \to \gamma \\ \delta \in \mathcal{P}_{k,2n-1}}} \varphi(\sigma_\delta) = \sum_{\substack{\epsilon \to \nu \\ \epsilon \in \mathcal{P}_{k,n}}} q^d\sigma_\epsilon + q^{d+1}\sigma_{\nu^-} = q^d \sum_{\substack{\epsilon \to \nu \\ \epsilon \in \mathcal{P}_{k,2n-1}}} \varphi(\sigma_\epsilon). \tag{3.13}$$

In particular, note that the n-core of ϵ equals ν^- if and only if $\nu_1 = n-k$ and $\nu_i > 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $\epsilon = \overline{\nu}$; otherwise, ϵ is an n-core.

Proposition 3.6. *In $QH^*_{T_n}(Gr(k,n))$, we have $\varphi\left(\sigma_{\overline{\lambda}} \cdot \widehat{\sigma_\mu}\right) = q\sigma_{\lambda^-} \circ \sigma_\mu$.*

The proof of Proposition 3.5 requires the use of abacus diagrams, which we discuss in Section 4. Proving Proposition 3.6 inspired the authors to develop a new polynomial model for equivariant quantum cohomology, which we call *cyclic factorial Schur polynomials*. Cyclic factorial Schur fuctions are discussed in Section 5. Assuming these two propositions for the moment, we will now proceed with the proof of one-box associativity.

Proof of Proposition 3.4. First we establish some notation. Suppose that $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{P}_{kn}$. We will write

$$\widehat{\sigma_\lambda} \cdot \widehat{\sigma_\mu} = \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_{k,2n-1}} c^\gamma_{\lambda,\mu}\sigma_\gamma, \tag{3.14}$$

and then write the rim hook reduction as

$$\varphi\left(\sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_{k,2n-1}} c^\gamma_{\lambda,\mu}\sigma_\gamma =\right) = \sum_{\substack{\nu \in \mathcal{P}_{kn} \\ d \geq 0}} \widetilde{c^{\nu,d}_{\lambda,\mu}} q^d \sigma_\nu. \tag{3.15}$$

We will do a direct calculation, using the two previously stated crucial lemmas, in order to prove the desired equality. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\sigma_\square \circ \sigma_\lambda) \circ \sigma_\mu \\
&= \left(\sum_{\substack{\delta \to \lambda \\ \delta \in \mathcal{P}_{kn}}} \sigma_\delta + q\sigma_{\lambda^-} + c^\lambda_{\lambda,\square}\sigma_\lambda \right) \circ \sigma_\mu && \text{by the equivariant rim hook Pieri rule} \\
&= \sum_{\substack{\delta \to \lambda \\ \delta \in \mathcal{P}_{kn}}} \sigma_\delta \circ \sigma_\mu + q\sigma_{\lambda^-} \circ \sigma_\mu + c^\lambda_{\lambda,\square}\sigma_\lambda \circ \sigma_\mu \\
&= \sum_{\substack{\delta \to \lambda \\ \delta \in \mathcal{P}_{kn}}} \sigma_\delta \circ \sigma_\mu + \varphi\left(\sigma_{\bar{\lambda}} \cdot \sigma_\mu\right) + c^\lambda_{\lambda,\square}\sigma_\lambda \circ \sigma_\mu && \text{by Proposition 3.6.}
\end{aligned}$$

But since $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{kn}$, then we may replace σ_μ by $\widehat{\sigma_\mu}$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\substack{\delta \to \lambda \\ \delta \in \mathcal{P}_{kn}}} \sigma_\delta \circ \sigma_\mu + \varphi\left(\sigma_{\bar{\lambda}} \cdot \widehat{\sigma_\mu}\right) + c^\lambda_{\lambda,\square}\sigma_\lambda \circ \sigma_\mu \\
&= \varphi\left(\sum_{\substack{\delta \to \lambda \\ \delta \in \mathcal{P}_{kn}}} \widehat{\sigma_\delta} \cdot \widehat{\sigma_\mu} \right) + \varphi\left(\sigma_{\bar{\lambda}} \cdot \widehat{\sigma_\mu}\right) + \varphi\left(c^\lambda_{\lambda,\square}\widehat{\sigma_\lambda} \cdot \widehat{\sigma_\mu}\right) \\
&= \varphi\left(\left(\sum_{\substack{\delta \to \lambda \\ \delta \in \mathcal{P}_{k,2n-1}}} \sigma_\delta + c^\lambda_{\lambda,\square}\widehat{\sigma_\lambda} \right) \cdot \widehat{\sigma_\mu} \right) \\
&= \varphi\left((\widehat{\sigma_\square} \cdot \widehat{\sigma_\lambda}) \cdot \widehat{\sigma_\mu} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Multiplication in the classical cohomology ring $H^*_T(Gr(k, 2n-1))$ is associative, and so here we may write

$$\begin{aligned}
&\varphi\left((\widehat{\sigma_\square} \cdot \widehat{\sigma_\lambda}) \cdot \widehat{\sigma_\mu} \right) \\
&= \varphi\left(\widehat{\sigma_\square} \cdot (\widehat{\sigma_\lambda} \cdot \widehat{\sigma_\mu}) \right) \\
&= \varphi\left(\widehat{\sigma_\square} \cdot \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_{k,2n-1}} c^\gamma_{\lambda,\mu}\sigma_\gamma \right) && \text{by Equation (3.14)} \\
&= \varphi\left(\sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_{k,2n-1}} c^\gamma_{\lambda,\mu}(\widehat{\sigma_\square} \cdot \sigma_\gamma) \right) \\
&= \varphi\left(\sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_{k,2n-1}} c^\gamma_{\lambda,\mu} \left(\sum_{\substack{\delta \to \gamma \\ \delta \in \mathcal{P}_{k,2n-1}}} \sigma_\delta + c^\gamma_{\gamma,\square}\sigma_\gamma \right) \right) && \text{by the equivariant Pieri rule} \\
&= \varphi\left(\sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_{k,2n-1}} c^\gamma_{\lambda,\mu} \sum_{\substack{\delta \to \gamma \\ \delta \in \mathcal{P}_{k,2n-1}}} \sigma_\delta \right) + \varphi\left(\sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_{k,2n-1}} c^\gamma_{\lambda,\mu}c^\gamma_{\gamma,\square}\sigma_\gamma \right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$= \varphi\left(\sum_{\gamma\in\mathcal{P}_{k,2n-1}} c^{\gamma}_{\lambda,\mu} \sum_{\substack{\delta\to\gamma \\ \delta\in\mathcal{P}_{k,2n-1}}} \sigma_\delta\right) + \sum_{\nu\in\mathcal{P}_{kn},d} \widetilde{c^{\nu,d}_{\lambda,\mu}} q^d c^{\nu}_{\nu,\,\square}\sigma_\nu \quad \text{by Lemma 4.4 and Equation (3.15)}$$

$$= \sum_{\nu\in\mathcal{P}_{kn},d} \widetilde{c^{\nu,d}_{\lambda,\mu}} q^d \varphi\left(\sum_{\substack{\epsilon\to\nu \\ \epsilon\in\mathcal{P}_{k,2n-1}}} \sigma_\epsilon\right) + \sum_{\nu\in\mathcal{P}_{kn},d} \widetilde{c^{\nu,d}_{\lambda,\mu}} q^d c^{\nu}_{\nu,\,\square}\sigma_\nu \quad \text{by Proposition 3.5}$$

$$= \sum_{\nu\in\mathcal{P}_{kn},d} \widetilde{c^{\nu,d}_{\lambda,\mu}} q^d \varphi\left(\sum_{\substack{\epsilon\to\nu \\ \epsilon\in\mathcal{P}_{k,2n-1}}} \sigma_\epsilon + c^{\nu}_{\nu,\square}\widehat{\sigma_\nu}\right)$$

$$= \sum_{\nu\in\mathcal{P}_{kn},d} \widetilde{c^{\nu,d}_{\lambda,\mu}} q^d \varphi\left(\widehat{\sigma_\square}\cdot\widehat{\sigma_\nu}\right) \quad \text{by the equivariant Pieri rule}$$

$$= \sum_{\nu\in\mathcal{P}_{kn},d} \widetilde{c^{\nu,d}_{\lambda,\mu}} q^d \left(\sigma_\square \circ \sigma_\nu\right)$$

$$= \sigma_\square \circ \sum_{\nu\in\mathcal{P}_{kn},d} \widetilde{c^{\nu,d}_{\lambda,\mu}} q^d \sigma_\nu$$

$$= \sigma_\square \circ \varphi\left(\sum_{\gamma\in\mathcal{P}_{k,2n-1}} c^{\gamma}_{\lambda,\mu}\sigma_\gamma\right) \quad \text{by Equation (3.15)}$$

$$= \sigma_\square \circ (\sigma_\lambda \circ \sigma_\mu). \quad \text{by Equation (3.14)}$$

Altogether we have thus shown that $(\sigma_\square \circ \sigma_\lambda) \circ \sigma_\mu = \sigma_\square \circ (\sigma_\lambda \circ \sigma_\mu)$, as desired. □

4. Abacus Diagrams and Core Partitions

4.1. **Abacus Diagrams, Partitions, and n-cores.** This section is devoted to the proof of the first key proposition in the proof of one box associativity, which is Proposition 3.5. The main tool for proving this proposition is the abacus model of a Young diagram; see [JK] for more details. The abacus model allows us to link covers in Young's lattice to the n-cores in $\mathcal{P}_{kn}$ which are the two key players in Proposition 3.5.

Definition 4.1. An **abacus** has n columns called **runners** labeled with all of the integers written in order, from left to right and then top to bottom. On the runners, an infinite number of **beads** are placed on the integers, satisfying the condition that there exists an integer N with no beads after N and a bead at every integer before $-N$. We require that the last k beads, called **active** beads, are the only beaded integers with a **gap** (a non-beaded integer) preceding them. Our convention places 0 on the leftmost runner.

To obtain the Young diagram λ corresponding to an abacus $\mathcal{A}$, start with the last bead, which has highest integer value. The number of gaps before the bead with exactly $i-1$ beads after it is λ_i. We recover $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_k)$ by looking at the k active beads. The left half of Figure 4.1 shows an abacus for $\lambda = (2,1)$ with $n = 3$ runners and two active beads. To create an abacus $\mathcal{A}$ from a partition λ, place a bead on every non-positive integer, and then for i from 1 to k, place a bead on location $\lambda_{k-i+1} + i - 1$. Note that there are many other abaci with corresponding partition λ, for example any abacus in which we translate all beads on the abacus vertically by the same amount.

Definition 4.2. An abacus is called **flush** if each bead has another bead directly above it.

For example, the abacus given on the left in figure 4.1 is not flush, but the abacus given on the right in figure 4.1 is flush. The abacus in figure 4.1 for $\lambda = (0)$ is the abacus obtained by making the abacus for $\lambda = (2,1)$ in figure 4.1 flush.



FIGURE 4.1. An abacus for $\lambda = (2,1)$ with 3 runners (left) and an abacus for $\lambda = (0)$ with 3 runners (right).

Theorem 4.3 (see [JK]). *λ is an n-core if and only if every (equivalently any) abacus corresponding to λ is flush. Additionally, removing a single n-rim hook from λ corresponds to moving one bead up one row on an abacus runner.*

4.2. **Coefficients in Equivariant Cohomology and n-cores.** We now prove several lemmas relating Littlewood-Richardson coefficients and n-cores to abacus diagrams in order to finally prove Proposition 3.5. In Lemma 4.4 we are able to give the equivariant Littlewood-Richardson coefficient $c^{\gamma}_{\gamma,\square}$ as sums over active beads on abacus diagrams and hence prove that the equivariant Littlewood-Richardson coefficient $c^{\gamma}_{\gamma,\square}$ behaves predictably under the map $t_i \mapsto t_{i \bmod n}$. Lemmas 4.5 and 4.6 link the covering relations in Young's lattice to abaci and give a necessary criterion on abaci for a partition to have n-core in $\mathcal{P}_{kn}$. Lemma 4.7 shows that it is possible to choose a unique preferred represenative abacus diagram for elements of $\mathcal{P}_{kn}$. Note that Lemma 4.7 is part of a more general phenomenon; see [JK] on balanced, flush abaci.

Lemma 4.4. *Suppose that γ rim hook reduces to ν by removing d rim hooks each of size n. Let $c^{\gamma}_{\gamma,\square}$ be a coefficient in $H^*_{T_{2n-1}}(Gr(k,2n-1))$ and $c^{\nu}_{\nu,\square}$ be a coefficient in $H^*_{T_n}(Gr(k,n))$. Then*

$$\varphi(c^{\gamma}_{\gamma,\square}) = c^{\nu}_{\nu,\square} = c^{\nu,0}_{\nu,\square} \in QH^*_{T_n}(Gr(k,n)).$$

In particular, this implies

$$\varphi\left(\sum_{i \in U(\gamma)} t_i\right) = \sum_{i \in U(\nu)} t_i. \tag{4.1}$$

Proof. The j^{th} vertical step described in Theorem 3.1 as the j^{th} element of $U(\gamma)$ is $j - 1 + g(j)$, where $g(j)$ is the number of gaps before the j^{th} active bead. We count active beads from the top of the abacus, so the first active bead corresponds to the smallest part in the partition. Thus, the equivariant Littlewood-Richardson coefficient $c^{\gamma}_{\gamma,\square}$ can be written as a sum over locations of active beads on an abacus independently of the number of runners:

$$c^{\gamma}_{\gamma,\square} = \sum_{j=1}^{k} (t_{j-1+g(j)} - t_j) = \left(\sum_{j=1}^{k} t_{j-1+g(j)}\right) - (t_1 + \cdots t_k), \tag{4.2}$$

where $g(j)$ is the number of gaps before the j^{th} bead.

Notice that the sum $t_1 + \ldots + t_k$ is constant under the map φ. By removing an n-rim hook, i.e. moving a bead up one row on its runner, and relabeling the k active beads in their new order, we see that moving a bead up or down on a particular runner changes the index $j - 1 + g(j)$ by n, so indices are constant modulo n. Therefore, under the map φ the two summands of $c^{\gamma}_{\gamma,\square}$ remain constant. Since φ does nothing in the case the abacus is flush, we conclude that $\varphi(c^{\gamma}_{\gamma,\square}) = c^{\gamma}_{\nu,\square}$. $\square$

Lemma 4.5. *When $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_k)$ and $\square(\lambda) = (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_{i-1}, \lambda_i + 1, \lambda_{i+1}, \ldots, \lambda_k)$ are both valid Young diagrams, an abacus for $\square(\lambda)$ can be obtained from an abacus for λ by moving a bead on the abacus for λ one runner to the right, or if it is already on the rightmost runner moving it to the leftmost runner down one row.*

Proof. The number of boxes in row i of a Young diagram λ corresponds to the number of gaps before the i^{th} from the last active bead in an abacus for λ. We can add a box in the i^{th} row if and only if there are at least $\lambda_i + 1$ boxes in the $(i+1)^{th}$ row of λ. This is the case if and only if there is a gap between the i^{th} and $(i+1)^{th}$ active bead in the abacus for λ. $\square$

Lemma 4.6. *If a Young diagram γ of at most k parts has n-core in $\mathcal{P}_{kn}$ then any abacus for γ has each of the k active beads on distinct runners.*

Proof. First, assume that γ is itself a Young diagram in $\mathcal{P}_{kn}$ (and hence an n-core). Since each part of γ is of size at most $n - k$, we have at most $n - k$ gaps between the first and last active bead. As there are n runners and k active beads, that means that the first active bead is located at most $n - 1$ runners away from the last active bead; *i.e.* each active bead is on a separate runner.

Taking an n-core does not change the runners on which the active beads of an abacus appear. Therefore, if γ has n-core in $\mathcal{P}_{kn}$, the active beads on γ's abacus must also be on distinct runners. $\square$

Lemma 4.7. *If $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_{kn}$ then there is a unique abacus for ν with all k active beads in the row containing 0 and the last active bead on location $n - 1$. Further such an abacus must necessarily have inactive beads at every location j for $j \leq -1$.*

Proof. By Lemma 4.6 the k active beads in any abacus for ν are on k different runners. Build an abacus $\mathcal{A}_\nu$ for ν by starting with an empty set of runners. Place a bead on location $n-1$. Then, for each i from 2 to k place a bead on location $n-1-(\nu_1-\nu_i)-(i-1)$. Note that we have now placed k active beads on locations between $n-1$ and $n-1-(\nu_1-\nu_k)-(k-1)$. Since $\nu_1-\nu_k \leq n-k$, the k active beads we have placed will fall on locations between $n-1$ and $n-1-(n-k)-(k-1) = 0$, all on the row containing 0. Finally, place an inactive bead on every location j for $j \leq n-1-\nu_1-k$.

We have now created an abacus $\mathcal{A}_\nu$ for ν with last bead at location $n-1$ and all beads in the row containing 0. There is also an inactive bead at every location $j \leq n-1-\nu_1-k$, but since $\nu_1 \leq n-k$, there is certainly an inactive bead at every location $j \leq n-1-(n-k)-k$, i.e. every location $j \leq -1$. Further, notice that if $\mathcal{A}'_\nu$ is another abacus for ν with last bead at location $n-1$ it must be exactly the same abacus as $\mathcal{A}_\nu$. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 3.5. Recall that Proposition 3.5 assumes that $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_{k,2n-1}$ rim hook reduces to the n-core $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_{kn}$ by removing d rim hooks.

We show the first equality in Equation (3.13) by showing that each term in the second expression appears in the first and then that each term appears at most once.

Let $\mathcal{A}_\gamma$ be an abacus for γ. We can obtain an abacus $\mathcal{A}_\nu$ for ν by moving each active bead on $\mathcal{A}_\gamma$ up as far as possible. Since each active bead of $\mathcal{A}_\gamma$ is on a different runner by Lemma 4.6, we may move the first active bead up as far as possible, then the second active bead up, and proceed in order to the last active bead. We need never move any bead again and we have obtained an abacus $\mathcal{A}_\nu$ for ν. From $\mathcal{A}_\nu$ we can obtain $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon$ for any $\epsilon \to \nu$ by moving an active bead one runner to the right on $\mathcal{A}_\nu$, according to Lemma 4.5. This will be an n-core unless the bead moves over a

gap, in which case the bead must be the last active bead in $\mathcal{A}_\nu$ by Lemma 4.6. In this case, taking the n-core of ϵ we must get ν^-. In either case, for each ϵ we can reverse the process of obtaining $\mathcal{A}_\nu$ from $\mathcal{A}_\gamma$ to obtain an abacus for a δ with n-core ϵ.

Now we show that each term in the second expression appears at most once in the first expression. We assume for sake of contradiction that two partitions $\delta_1 \to \gamma$ and $\delta_2 \to \gamma$ and δ_1 and δ_2 rim hook reduce to the same $\epsilon \in \mathcal{P}_{kn}$. Consider an abacus $\mathcal{A}_\nu$ for ν as constructed in Lemma 4.7, and fix $\mathcal{A}_\gamma$ an abacus for γ that reduces to $\mathcal{A}_\nu$. Abaci corresponding to δ_1 and δ_2, say $\mathcal{A}_{\delta_1}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{\delta_2}$, can be obtained by moving a bead from $\mathcal{A}_\gamma$ one runner to the right.

If neither bead moved was on the rightmost runner in $\mathcal{A}_\gamma$, then when $\mathcal{A}_{\delta_1}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{\delta_2}$ are made flush to obtain an abacus for ϵ, we must get the same abacus in both cases, the unique abacus for ϵ constructed in Lemma 4.7. Since $\mathcal{A}_{\delta_1}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{\delta_2}$ differed only in two beads in order not to violate Lemma 4.6, we must have $\mathcal{A}_{\delta_1} = \mathcal{A}_{\delta_2}$ and hence $\delta_1 = \delta_2$, a contradiction.

Now suppose that to create $\mathcal{A}_{\delta_1}$ we move the bead on the rightmost runner in $\mathcal{A}_\gamma$ to the leftmost runner. If there is no inactive bead on location 0 in $\mathcal{A}_\gamma$ then again all of the active beads will be in row 0 when $\mathcal{A}_{\delta_1}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{\delta_2}$ are made flush, but these two flush abaci will have unequal k^{th} parts and cannot be the same ϵ. If there is a non-active bead at 0 in $\mathcal{A}_\gamma$, then the bead moved to the leftmost runner to form $\mathcal{A}_{\delta_1}$ will still correspond to the largest part of ϵ when $\mathcal{A}_{\delta_1}$ is made flush. Since $\mathcal{A}_{\delta_1} \neq \mathcal{A}_{\delta_2}$, then via construction their n-cores do not have equal first parts, which is a contradiction.

The second equality in Equation (3.13) follows from the proof of Proposition 3.3. □

5. Cyclic Factorial Schur Polynomials

5.1. **Polynomial Presentations for Equivariant Cohomology.** The technical heart of much of this paper is devoted to the proof of Proposition 3.6, for which the concept of *cyclic factorial Schur polynomials* is now introduced. To complete our proof of the equivariant rim hook rule, we show that the reduction map φ on the equivariant cohomology ring with the Schubert basis gives rise to a corresponding map on factorial Schur polynomials.

By the Borel isomorphism, we know that

$$H^*_{T_{2n-1}}(Gr(k, 2n-1)) \cong \frac{\mathbb{Z}[e_1(x|t), \ldots, e_k(x|t)]}{\langle h_{2n-k}(x|t), \ldots, h_{2n-1}(x|t)\rangle}. \tag{5.1}$$

As discussed in Section 2, $e_i(x|t)$ are the factorial elementary symmetric polynomials and $h_i(x|t)$ are the factorial homogenous complete symmetric polynomials, both in the variables $x_1, \ldots, x_k$ and $t_1, \ldots, t_{2n-1}$. In addition, recall from [Mih2] that

$$QH^*_{T_n}(Gr(k, n)) \cong \frac{\mathbb{Z}[q, e_1(x|t), \ldots, e_k(x|t)]}{\langle h_{n-k+1}(x|t), \ldots, h_n(x|t) + (-1)^k q\rangle}, \tag{5.2}$$

where now the $e_i(x|t)$ and $h_i(x|t)$ are the factorial elementary symmetric and homogenous complete symmetric polynomials in $x_1, \ldots, x_k$ and $t_1, \ldots, t_n$. In this context we will often denote the "quantum ideal" by

$$J = \langle h_{n-k+1}(x|t), \ldots, h_n(x|t) + (-1)^k q\rangle.$$

Recall that under both of these isomorphisms, the class σ_λ corresponds to the factorial Schur polynomial $s_\lambda(x|t)$.

Definition 5.1. We define **cyclic factorial Schur polynomials** to be the polynomials obtained by reducing factorial Schur polynomials in $2n-1$ torus variables t_i to polynomials in n torus variables via the reduction $t_i \mapsto t_{i \bmod n}$. We denote the cyclic factorial Schur polynomial corresponding to a partition $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{kn}$ by $\widetilde{s}_\lambda$.

For brevity, we denote the two rings of factorial Schur polynomials by

$$R = \mathbb{Z}[q, e_1(x|t), \ldots, e_k(x|t)]/J$$
$$\widetilde{R} = \mathbb{Z}[e_1(x|t), \ldots, e_k(x|t)]/\langle h_{2n-k}(x|t), \ldots, h_{2n-1}(x|t)\rangle.$$

Algebraically, the reduction map

$$\varphi : H^*_{T_{2n-1}}(Gr(k, 2n-1)) \longrightarrow QH^*_{T_n}(Gr(k, n))$$

then corresponds to a map of polynomial rings $\tilde{\varphi} : \widetilde{R} \longrightarrow R$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned} t_i &\longmapsto t_{i(\mathrm{mod}\, n)} \\ s_\gamma(x|t) &\longmapsto \begin{cases} \prod_{i=1}^{d} \left((-1)^{(\varepsilon_i - k)} q\right) s_\nu(x|t) & \text{if } \nu \in \mathcal{P}_{kn}, \\ 0 & \text{if } \nu \notin \mathcal{P}_{kn}, \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

where ν is the n-core of γ. Notice that the reduction $t_i \mapsto t_{i \bmod n}$ is the identity on the ring R, since the torus weight with largest index occurring in a factorial Schur polynomial in this ring is $k + n - k - 1 = n - 1$.

Recall that Theorem 2.4 provides a way to calculate the product of two Schubert classes $\sigma_\lambda \star \sigma_\mu$ in $QH^*_{T_n}(Gr(k, n))$ using the reduction map φ. In particular,

$$\sigma_\lambda \star \sigma_\mu = \sigma_\lambda \circ \sigma_\mu = \varphi\left(\widehat{\sigma_\lambda} \cdot \widehat{\sigma_\mu}\right)$$

where $\widehat{\sigma_\lambda}$ is the lift of σ_λ to $H^*_{T_{2n-1}}(Gr(k, 2n-1))$. This perspective gives rise to the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H^*_{T_{2n-1}}(Gr(k,2n-1)) \otimes H^*_{T_{2n-1}}(Gr(k,2n-1)) & \xrightarrow{\cdot} & H^*_{T_{2n-1}}(Gr(k,2n-1)) \\ \uparrow{\scriptstyle \hat{\cdot}} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \varphi} \\ H^*_{T_n}(Gr(k,n)) \otimes H^*_{T}(Gr(k,n)) & \xrightarrow{\circ} & QH^*_{T_n}(Gr(k,n)) \end{array}$$

Using the definition of the map φ on factorial Schur polynomials from (5.3) together with the Borel isomorphism, we get a corresponding commutative diagram in terms of factorial Schur polynomials. As in Section 2, the lift of a factorial Schur polynomial $s_\lambda(x|t)$ from R to $\widetilde{R}$ is the identity. Because $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{kn}$, the only t_i appearing in $s_\lambda(x|t) \in R$ are $t_1, \ldots t_{n-1}$, so this lift is unique. These two diagrams can then in turn be viewed as sides of the following three-dimensional diagram by using the isomorphisms from Equations (5.1) and (5.2). Please note that in the diagram below we abbreviate $H^*_{T_n}(Gr(k, n))$ by $H^*_{T_n}$ and $QH^*_{T_n}(Gr(k, n))$ by $QH^*_{T_n}$.



5.2. **Direct Analog of the Rim Hook Rule.** As a reminder, Proposition 3.6 states that in $QH^*_{T_n}(Gr(k,n))$, we have

$$\varphi\left(\sigma_{\overline{\lambda}} \cdot \widehat{\sigma_\mu}\right) = q\sigma_{\lambda^-} \circ \sigma_\mu, \tag{5.4}$$

where $\mu, \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{kn}$ with $\lambda_1 = n-k$. Here we prove a reformulation of this proposition in terms of factorial Schur polynomials. In order for such a reformulation to suffice, we need to know that the rightmost square in the above three-dimensional diagram commutes. To this extent, we first prove the following direct equivariant analogue of the rim hook rule in [BCFF]:

Proposition 5.2. *[Equivariant version of rim hook rule in [BCFF]] Let λ be any partition. In the ring R,*

(a) *If $\lambda_1 > n-k$ and λ contains no n-rim, then $s_\lambda(x|t) = 0 \bmod J$.*
(b) *If $\lambda_{k+1} > 0$, then $s_\lambda(x|t) = 0 \bmod J$.*
(c) *If λ contains an illegal n-rim hook, then $s_\lambda(x|t) = 0 \bmod J$. (An illegal n-rim is one which starts at the end of a row, moves down and to the left, and ends at an inner corner. When removed it leaves a non-valid partition.)*
(d) *If ν is the result of removing an n-rim hook from λ, then*

$$s_\lambda = (-1)^{n-h} q s_\nu \bmod J,$$

where h is the height of the n-rim hook removed.

From part (d) in particular, we see that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H^*_{T_{2n-1}}(Gr(k,2n-1)) & \longleftrightarrow & \widetilde{R} \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \varphi} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \tilde{\varphi}} \\ QH^*_T(Gr(k,n)) & \longleftrightarrow & R \end{array}$$

Since the three-dimensional diagram above is commutative, it therefore suffices to prove the following reformulation of Proposition 3.6 in terms of factorial Schur polynomials.

Proposition 5.3. *For $\mu, \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{kn}$ with $\lambda_1 = n-k$,*

$$\varphi(s_{\overline{\lambda}}(x|t)s_\mu(x|t)) = q s_{\lambda^-}(x|t)s_\mu(x|t) \bmod J. \tag{5.5}$$

Example 5.4. Before moving into the proof of these two propositions, we illustrate the power of cyclic factorial Schur polynomials by rewriting Example 2.5 in terms of cyclic factorial Schur polynomials. First, in $H^*_{T_6}(Gr(2,6))$, we multiply $s_{\square\square} \cdot s_{\square\square}$:

$$\begin{aligned} s_{\square\square} \cdot s_{\square\square} = {} & (t_4-t_3)(t_4-t_2)s_{\square\square} + (t_4-t_3)s_{\begin{smallmatrix}\square\square\\\square\end{smallmatrix}} + s_{\begin{smallmatrix}\square\square\\\square\square\end{smallmatrix}} \\ & + (t_5+t_4-t_3-t_2)s_{\square\square\square} + s_{\begin{smallmatrix}\square\square\square\\\square\end{smallmatrix}} + s_{\square\square\square\square}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

Then, we reduce the t_i via $t_i \mapsto t_{i \bmod 4}$

$$(t_4-t_3)(t_4-t_2)\widetilde{s_{\square\square}} + (t_4-t_3)\widetilde{s_{\begin{smallmatrix}\square\square\\\square\end{smallmatrix}}} + \widetilde{s_{\begin{smallmatrix}\square\square\\\square\square\end{smallmatrix}}} + (t_1+t_4-t_3-t_2)\widetilde{s_{\square\square\square}} + \widetilde{s_{\begin{smallmatrix}\square\square\square\\\square\end{smallmatrix}}} + \widetilde{s_{\square\square\square\square}}$$

where $\widetilde{s_\lambda}$ is the cyclic factorial Schur polynomial corresponding the partition λ. Using Lemma 5.2, we see that modulo the ideal J this expression is equal to

$$(t_4-t_3)(t_4-t_2)s_{\square\square} + (t_4-t_3)s_{\begin{smallmatrix}\square\square\\\square\end{smallmatrix}} + s_{\begin{smallmatrix}\square\square\\\square\square\end{smallmatrix}} + (t_1+t_4-t_3-t_2)0 + q + (-q)$$

This example thus illustrates how cyclic factorial Schur polynomials provide a system of polynomial representatives for quantum cohomology which does not explicitly contain a quantum parameter.

5.3. **Jacobi-Trudi Formulas and Cyclic Factorial Schur Polynomials.** This section relies heavily on the Jacobi-Trudi formula for expanding factorial Schur polynomials in terms of factorial complete homogeneous polynomials. Set $\tau^{-s}t$ to be the shifted torus weights, $\tau^{-s}t_i = t_{-s+i}$. The **factorial Jacobi-Trudi formula** (see [Mih1, Mac]) states that

$$s_\lambda(x|t) = \det(h_{\lambda_i+j-i}(x|\tau^{1-j}t))_{1\leq i,j\leq k}. \tag{5.7}$$

Since cyclic factorial Schur polynomials are a specialization of factorial Schur polynomials, this formula extends. For brevity, let M_ν denote the matrix appearing in the Jacobi-Trudi formula for s_ν. The proofs of Propositions 5.2 and 5.3 first require a lemma on quantum invariance under a shift in torus weights. We then proceed to an argument using an expansion of the matrices obtained by multiplying the Jacobi-Trudi expansions of factorial Schur polynomials under consideration.

Lemma 5.5 (Quantum invariance under shift)**.** *In the ring* R*,*

$$h_m(x|\tau^{-s}t) = 0 \bmod J \tag{5.8}$$

for all s *and all* m *such that* $n-k < m < n$*, and*

$$h_n(x|\tau^{-s}t) = q \bmod J \tag{5.9}$$

for all s*.*

Proof. First we establish the base case, invariance under shift of the polynomial $h_{n-k+1}(x|\tau^{-s}t)$. By [Mih1], it is true for all s and given m that

$$h_m(x|\tau^{-s}t) = h_m(x|\tau^{-s+1}t) + (t_{m+k-s} - t_{-s+1})h_{m-1}(x|\tau^{-s+1}t). \tag{5.10}$$

Substituting $m = n-k+\ell$ gives the useful equation

$$h_{n-k+\ell}(x|\tau^{-s}t) = h_{n-k+\ell}(x|\tau^{-s+1}t) + (t_{n-k+\ell+k-s} - t_{-s+1})h_{n-k+\ell-1}(x|\tau^{-s+1}t). \tag{5.11}$$

Notice that for $\ell = 1$, this simplifies to

$$h_{n-k+1}(x|\tau^{-s}t) = h_{n-k+1}(x|\tau^{-s+1}t) + (t_{n-s+1} - t_{-s+1})h_{n-k}(x|\tau^{-s+1}t), \tag{5.12}$$

and under our reduction of indices on torus weights modulo n, the difference $t_{n-s+1} - t_{-s+1}$ is zero. Thus

$$h_{n-k+1}(x|\tau^{-s}t) = h_{n-k+1}(x|\tau^{-s+1}t) \tag{5.13}$$

and because $h_{n-k+1}(x|t) \in J$, we see that any shift by τ is also in J. This is the base case for induction.

For $1 < \ell < k$ we use Equation 5.11 and the assertion that $h_{n-k+\ell-1}(x|\tau^{-s+1}t) = 0 \bmod J$ under the inductive hypothesis (invariance of the polynomial under shifting τ^{-s}). Note that $h_{n-k+\ell-1}(x|t) \in J$. This establishes the first statement in the lemma.

For the second statement, $j = n$ implies

$$h_n(x|\tau^{-s}t) = h_n(x|\tau^{-s+1}t) + (t_{n+k-s} - t_{-s+1})h_{n-1}(x|\tau^{-s+1}t),$$

but by our previous computations $h_{n-1}(x|\tau^{-s+1}t)$ is zero modulo J and so

$$h_n(x|\tau^{-s}t) = h_n(x|\tau^{-s+1}t).$$

□

We now proceed to prove the two key propositions in this section, starting with the equivariant generalization of the rim hook rule from [BCFF].

Proof of Proposition 5.2. Part (a): consider λ with $\lambda_1 > n-k$ such that λ does not have an n-rim hook. Reducing mod J we get zero: in R, we have

$$s_\lambda(x|t) = \det(h_{\lambda_i+j-i}(x|\tau^{1-j}t))_{1\le i,j\le k},$$

and since $\lambda_1 > n-k$, the first row of the matrix under consideration consists of cyclic factorial Schur polynomials $h_{\lambda_i+j-1}(x|\tau^{1-j}t)$ for $1 \le j \le k$. All these polynomials in the first row are elements of J so they are zero in R.

Part (b): if $\lambda_{k+1} > 0$, we have $s_\lambda(x|t) = 0$ by definition.

Part (c): If λ contains an illegal n-rim hook, a determinental argument shows $s_\lambda(x|t) = 0$. If an n-rim hook is removed from λ starting in row r and ending in row s, the resulting shape has row lengths

$$(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_{r-1}, \lambda_{r+1}-1, \lambda_{r+2}-1, \ldots, \lambda_s - 1, \lambda_r - r + s - n, \lambda_{s+1}, \ldots, \lambda_k).$$

As discussed in [BCFF], the n-rim hook is illegal when $\lambda_r - r + s - n = \lambda_{s+1} - 1$. Define a Jacobi-Trudi identity

$$\Upsilon_m = \det(h_{m_i+j-i})_{1\le i,j\le k}$$

for any composition $m = (m_1, \ldots, m_k)$. Apply it to the shape resulting from removing the illegal n-rim hook from λ. Row s in the Jacobi-Trudi matrix is

$$[h_{\lambda_r-r+s-n+1-s}(x|t),\ \ h_{\lambda_r-r+s-n+2-s}(x|\tau^{-1}t),\ \ \ldots,\ \ h_{\lambda_r-r+s-n+k-s}(x|\tau^{1-k}t)].$$

Row $s+1$ is

$$[h_{\lambda_{s+1}+1-s-1}(x|t),\ \ h_{\lambda_{s+1}+2-s-1}(x|\tau^{-1}t),\ \ \ldots,\ \ h_{\lambda_{s+1}+k-s-1}(x|\tau^{1-k}t)].$$

Since $\lambda_{s+1} = \lambda_r - r + s - n + 1$, these are the same, and so the determinant is zero.

Part (d): If λ rimhook-reduces to $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_{kn}$ by removing d rimhooks of length n, then the factorial Schur polynomial $s_\lambda \in R$ reduces to the quantum cyclic Schur polynomial $q^d \widetilde{s}_\nu$.

We first prove a version of a formula on page 2295 of [Mih2]:

$$s_{\bar{\lambda}}(x|t) = q s_{\lambda^-}(x|t) \bmod J = q\widetilde{s}_{\lambda^-}(x|t).$$

By the factorial Jacobi-Trudi formula,

$$s_{\bar{\lambda}}(x|t) = \det\begin{bmatrix} h_{n-k+1}(x|t) & h_{n-k+2}(x|\tau^{-1}t) & \cdots & h_n(x|\tau^{1-k}t) \\ h_{\lambda_2-1}(x|t) & \cdots & & h_{\lambda_2+k-1}(x|\tau^{1-k}t) \\ \cdots & & & \cdots \\ h_{\lambda_k-k+1}(x|t) & \cdots & \cdots & h_{\lambda_k}(x|\tau^{1-k}t) \end{bmatrix}. \tag{5.14}$$

Modulo the relations in the ideal J, every entry in the top row is zero except for $h_n(x|\tau^{1-k}t_i) = (-1)^{n-k}q$. Expanding the determinant along the top row then gives

$$s_{\bar{\lambda}}(x|t) = q \det\begin{bmatrix} h_{\lambda_2-1}(x|t) & \cdots & h_{\lambda_2+k-2}(x|\tau^{1-k}t) \\ \cdots & & \cdots \\ h_{\lambda_k+1-k}(x|t) & \cdots \quad \cdots & h_{\lambda_k-1}(x|\tau^{1-k}t) \end{bmatrix},$$

where the determinant is of a $k-1 \times k-1$ matrix. Recall that $h_n(x|t) + (-1)^k q = 0$. We get an opposite $(-1)^k$ from the determinant expansion and the signs cancel. Notice that $\lambda^- = (\lambda_2 - 1, \lambda_3 - 1, \ldots, \lambda_k - 1, 0)$, and this right-hand side is exactly $q\widetilde{s}_{\lambda^-(x|t)}$ by factorial Jacobi-Trudi. This proves that the map φ satisfies Mihalcea's statement.

Part (d) goes further and says that if λ rim hook reduces to $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_{kn}$ by removing one rim hook of size n, then

$$s_\lambda = (-1)^{n-h} q \widetilde{s}_\nu \bmod J.$$

Assume $\lambda_1 \ge n - k + 1$. It is easiest to prove this statement by showing that for cyclic factorial Schur polynomials,

$$h_{nd+j}(x|t) = (-1)^{d(n-k-1)} q^d h_j(x|t), \tag{5.15}$$

We prove this inductively below in Lemma 5.6.

Following [BCFF], let m again be a sequence of integers $(m_1, \ldots, m_k)$ and set

$$\Upsilon_m = \det(h_{m_i+j-i})_{1\leq i,j\leq k}. \tag{5.16}$$

By assumption, there is some λ_ℓ for which $\lambda_\ell > n-k$; take one of these rows and call it s. Apply Lemma 5.6 to row s, as every entry in that row will either have $n-k < \ell-i+j < n$ or $\ell-i+j \geq n$ and so each entry will be zero or will be a multiple of q by Lemma 5.6.

Factor out one q from all such rows, and then notice that then we will have the identity

$$\Upsilon_m = (-1)^{n-k-1} q \Upsilon_{m''} \tag{5.17}$$

where $m'' = (m_1, \ldots, m_{s-1}, m_s - n, m_{s+1}, \ldots, m_k)$. Rearrange the rows of the matrix to put them "back in order", recalling that if $1 \leq r < s \leq k$ and the rth row of the matrix is swapped with the $(r+1)$st, then the $(r+2)$nd, and so on until the sth row, we have

$$\Upsilon_m = (-1)^{s-r} \Upsilon_{m'} \tag{5.18}$$

where m is the sequence defined above and $m' = (m_1, \ldots, m_{r-1}, m_{r+1} - 1, \ldots, m_s - 1, m_r - r + s, m_{s+1}, \ldots, m_k)$. Combining these two processes of factoring out q and rearranging rows so that the resulting m''' is strictly decreasing, we get

$$\Upsilon_m = (-1)^{n-k-1+s-r} q \Upsilon_{m'''} \tag{5.19}$$

with $m''' = (m_1, \ldots, m_{r-1}, m_{r+1} - 1, \ldots, m_s - 1, m_r - r + s - n, m_{s+1}, \ldots, m_k) - \lambda$ with a rim hook removed. (If at any point there was no rim hook to remove the process would halt, and an illegal rim hook would result in determinant zero.) If another rim hook can be removed, repeat. This gives part (d). □

Lemma 5.6. *In the ring* R,

$$h_{nd+j}(x|t) = (-1)^{d(n-k-1)} q^d h_j(x|t) \bmod J.$$

Proof. First we present relevant identities and a short example, and then we induct on the degree of the homogeneous polynomial using degree n as the base case. We know that $h_n(x|t) = (-1)^k q$ in R as this is a relation in J.

Use formula (2.10) in [Mih2] to write

$$\sum_{r=0}^{k} (-1)^r e_r(x|t) h_{s-r}(x|\tau^{1-s}t) = 0 \tag{5.20}$$

for each positive s. An alternative and equivalent formulation is

$$\sum_{r=0}^{k} (-1)^r e_r(x|\tau^{s-1}t) h_{s-r}(x|t) = 0. \tag{5.21}$$

As an example of how the proof will go, look at the case $s = n+1$. Then

$$\sum_{r=0}^{k} (-1)^r e_r(x|t) h_{n+1-r}(x|\tau^{-n}t) = h_{n+1}(x|t) - h_n(x|t)e_1(x|t) + \ldots \pm h_{n-k+1}(x|t)e_k(x|t) \tag{5.22}$$

$$= 0. \tag{5.23}$$

The relations in the ideal J eliminate most terms in the middle equation and give

$$h_{n+1}(x|t) = h_n(x|t)e_1(x|t). \tag{5.24}$$

This can be rewritten using the quantum relation to give

$$h_{n+1}(x|t) = (-1)^k q e_1(x|t). \tag{5.25}$$

We now induct. Let $m > n$, and write $m = nd + j$ for positive d and $0 \leq j \leq n-1$. Use equation 5.21 again to write

$$\sum_{r=0}^{k} (-1)^r e_r(x|\tau^{m-1}t) h_{m-r}(x|t) = 0. \tag{5.26}$$

Move $h_m(x|t)$ to the left-hand side to write

$$h_m(x|t) = \sum_{r=1}^{k} (-1)^{r+1} e_i(x|\tau^{i-1}t) h_{r-i}(x|\tau^{1-i}t). \tag{5.27}$$

Use the inductive hypothesis on r to write each polynomial $h_{r-i}(x|\tau^{1-i}t)$ on the right-hand side in terms of q. Get

$$h_{nd+j}(x|t) = (-1)^{d(k-1)} q^d h_j(x|t). \tag{5.28}$$

□

Proof of Proposition 5.3. To establish Proposition 5.3, we use the Jacobi-Trudi formula to expand the products of the Schur polynomials $s_{\bar{\lambda}}(x|t)s_\mu(x|t)$ and $s_{\lambda^-}(x|t)s_\mu(x|t)$. Then

$$M_{\bar{\lambda}} = \begin{bmatrix} h_{n-k+1}(x|t) & h_{n-k+2}(x|\tau^{-1}t) & \cdots & h_n(x|\tau^{1-k}t) \\ h_{\lambda_2-1}(x|t) & \cdots & \cdots & h_{\lambda_2+k-1}(x|\tau^{1-k}t) \\ \cdots & & & \cdots \\ h_{\lambda_k+1-k}(x|t) & \cdots & \cdots & h_{\lambda_k}(x|\tau^{1-k}t) \end{bmatrix}, \tag{5.29}$$

$$M_\mu = \begin{bmatrix} h_{\mu_1}(x|t) & h_{\mu_1+1}(x|\tau^{-1}t) & \cdots & h_{\mu_1+k-1}(x|\tau^{1-k}t) \\ h_{\mu_2-1}(x|t) & \cdots & \cdots & h_{\mu_2+k-1}(x|\tau^{1-k}t) \\ \cdots & & & \cdots \\ h_{\mu_k+1-k}(x|t) & \cdots & \cdots & h_{\mu_k}(x|\tau^{1-k}t) \end{bmatrix}, \tag{5.30}$$

and so we can compute that

$$s_{\bar{\lambda}}(x|t)s_\mu(x|t) = \det\left(M_{\bar{\lambda}} M_\mu\right) \tag{5.31}$$

$$= \det\left(\sum_{\ell=1}^{k} h_{\bar{\lambda}_i+i-\ell}(x|\tau^{1-\ell}) h_{\mu_\ell+j-\ell}(x|\tau^{1-j}t)\right)_{1\leq i,j\leq k}. \tag{5.32}$$

Using Lemma 5.5 above, notice that $h_{n-k+1+i-\ell}(x|\tau^s t)$ is zero modulo the quantum ideal J when $n-k+1+i-\ell$ takes values between $n-k+1$ and $n-1$. Since $\bar{\lambda}_1 = n-k+1$, the only entry in the first row of the matrix $M_{\bar{\lambda}} M_\mu$ that is non-zero modulo J is the last entry. Expanding the determinant along the first row of the matrix then gives

$$(-1)^k h_n(x|\tau^{1-k}t) \det\left(\sum_{\ell=1}^{k-1} h_{\lambda_{i+1}-1+\ell-i+1}(x|\tau^{1-\ell}t) h_{\mu_\ell-\ell+j}(x|\tau^{1-j}t)\right) =$$

$$(-1)^k q \det\left(\sum_{\ell=1}^{k-1} h_{\lambda_{i+1}-1+\ell-i+1}(x|\tau^{1-\ell}t) h_{\mu_\ell-\ell+j}(x|\tau^{1-j}t)\right) \tag{5.33}$$

where the second inequality is given by the second part of Lemma 5.5

By contrast, expanding $s_{\lambda^-}(x|t)s_\mu(x|t)$ in a similar fashion gives

$$s_{\lambda^-}(x|t)s_\mu(x|t) = \det\left(M_{\lambda^-} M_\mu\right) \tag{5.34}$$

$$= \det\left(\sum_{\ell=1}^{k} h_{\lambda_{i+1}-1+\ell-i+1}(x|\tau^{1-\ell}t) h_{\mu_\ell-\ell+j}(x|\tau^{1-j}t)\right). \tag{5.35}$$

Since $\lambda_{k+1} = 0$, the last row of the matrix $M_{\lambda^-}M_\mu$ consists of $k-1$ zeroes followed by a one. Expanding the determinant then gives

$$s_{\lambda^-}(x|t)s_\mu(x|t) = (-1)^k \det\left(\sum_{\ell=1}^{k-1} h_{\lambda_{i+1}-1+\ell-i+1}(x|\tau^{1-\ell}t)h_{\mu_\ell-\ell+j}(x|\tau^{1-j}t)\right). \tag{5.36}$$

The reduction $\widetilde{\varphi}$ applied to equation 5.33 is the identity, since the indices of t_i range only between 1 and n (see the definition of factorial Schur polynomial for $\overline{\lambda}$). Thus

$$\varphi(s_{\overline{\lambda}}(x|t)s_\mu(x|t)) = (-1)^k q \det\left(\sum_{\ell=1}^{k-1} h_{\lambda_{i+1}-1+\ell-i+1}(x|\tau^{1-\ell}t)h_{\mu_\ell-\ell+j}(x|\tau^{1-j}t)\right) \bmod J. \tag{5.37}$$

We see $s_{\lambda^-}(x|t)s_\mu(x|t) = \widetilde{s}_{\lambda^-}(x|t)\widetilde{s}_\mu(x|t)$ and $\varphi(s_{\overline{\lambda}}(x|t)s_\mu(x|t))$ differ by exactly the factor q, as desired. Thus

$$\varphi(s_{\overline{\lambda}}(x|t)s_\mu(x|t)) = q s_{\lambda^-}(x|t)s_\mu(x|t) \bmod J.$$

□

6. Identities on Equivariant Littlewood-Richardson Coefficients

In this section, we provide several identities relating equivariant quantum and non-quantum Littlewood-Richardson coefficients which arise as a consequence of the rim hook rule. Most of these identities stem from comparing the equivariant rim hook rule and Mihalcea's recursion on EQLR coefficients.

Theorem 6.1 (Mihalcea [Mih1]). *Let $\lambda, \mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_{kn}$ be any partitions and $d \geq 0$ be any integer. Then*

$$c_{\lambda,\mu}^{\nu,d} = \frac{1}{c_{\nu,\square}^{\nu} - c_{\lambda,\square}^{\lambda}}\left(\sum_{\delta\to\lambda} c_{\delta,\mu}^{\nu,d} - \sum_{\nu\to\zeta} c_{\lambda,\mu}^{\zeta,d} + c_{\lambda^-,\mu}^{\nu,d-1} - c_{\lambda,\mu}^{\nu^+,d-1}\right). \tag{6.1}$$

Here, the third (resp. fourth) term is omitted if λ^- (resp. ν^+) does not exist. If $d = 0$, both the third and fourth terms are omitted.

Proposition 6.2. *Fix $\lambda, \mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_{kn}$. Let Γ be the set of partitions in $\mathcal{P}_{k,2n-1}$ which n-rim hook reduce to ν by removing d rim hooks. Then*

$$\varphi\left(\sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma} c_{\overline{\lambda},\mu}^{\gamma}\right) = c_{\lambda^-,\mu}^{\nu,d-1}. \tag{6.2}$$

If $\lambda_1 < n-k$, note that λ^- does not exist and so $c_{\lambda^-,\mu}^{\nu,d-1} = 0$. More generally, if $\delta \in \mathcal{P}_{kn}$ and ε is any partition that reduces to δ by removing a single n-rim hook, then

$$\varphi\left(\sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma} c_{\varepsilon,\mu}^{\gamma}\right) = c_{\delta,\mu}^{\nu,d-1}. \tag{6.3}$$

Proof. By Theorem 2.4 we know that $c_{\lambda,\mu}^{\nu,d} = \sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma} \varphi(c_{\lambda,\mu}^{\gamma})$. Applying this theorem, the above recursion in the case in which $d = 0$, and Equation (4.1) then gives us

$$
\begin{aligned}
c_{\lambda,\mu}^{\nu,d} &= \sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma} \varphi\left(c_{\lambda,\mu}^{\gamma}\right) && (6.4)\\
&= \sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma} \varphi\left(\frac{1}{c_{\gamma,\square}^{\gamma} - c_{\lambda,\square}^{\lambda}}\left(\sum_{\delta\to\lambda} c_{\delta,\mu}^{\gamma} - \sum_{\gamma\to\zeta} c_{\lambda,\mu}^{\zeta}\right)\right) && (6.5)\\
&= \sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma} \varphi\left(\frac{1}{\sum\limits_{i\in U(\gamma)} t_i - \sum\limits_{j\in U(\lambda)} t_j}\left(\sum_{\delta\to\lambda} c_{\delta,\mu}^{\gamma} - \sum_{\gamma\to\zeta} c_{\lambda,\mu}^{\zeta}\right)\right) && (6.6)\\
&= \frac{1}{\sum\limits_{i\in U(\nu)} t_i - \sum\limits_{j\in U(\lambda)} t_j}\left(\sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma} \varphi\left(\sum_{\delta\to\lambda} c_{\delta,\mu}^{\gamma} - \sum_{\gamma\to\zeta} c_{\lambda,\mu}^{\zeta}\right)\right) && (6.7)\\
&= \frac{1}{c_{\nu,\square}^{\nu} - c_{\lambda,\square}^{\lambda}}\left(\sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma} \varphi\left(\sum_{\delta\to\lambda} c_{\delta,\mu}^{\gamma}\right) - \sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma} \varphi\left(\sum_{\gamma\to\zeta} c_{\lambda,\mu}^{\zeta}\right)\right) && (6.8)\\
&= \frac{1}{c_{\nu,\square}^{\nu} - c_{\lambda,\square}^{\lambda}}\left(\sum_{\substack{\delta\to\lambda\\ \delta\in\mathcal{P}_{kn}}} c_{\delta,\mu}^{\nu,d} + \varphi\left(\sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma} c_{\overline{\lambda},\mu}^{\gamma}\right) - \left(\sum_{\nu\to\zeta} c_{\lambda,\mu}^{\zeta,d} + c_{\lambda,\mu}^{\nu^+,d-1}\right)\right) && (6.9)\\
& && (6.10)
\end{aligned}
$$

Comparing term by term with the recursion in Equation (6.1) gives us the equality

$$\varphi\left(\sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma} c_{\overline{\lambda},\mu}^{\gamma}\right) = c_{\lambda^-,\mu}^{\nu,d-1}. \tag{6.11}$$

To obtain the more general version, apply the same argument to compute $c_{\varepsilon',\mu}^{\nu,d}$, where $\overline{\varepsilon'} = \varepsilon$. □

Corollary 6.3. *Fix $\lambda, \mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_{kn}$, and let Γ be the set of partitions in $\mathcal{P}_{k,2n-1}$ which n-rim hook reduce to ν by removing d rim hooks. Then*

$$\sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma}\sum_{\delta\to\lambda} \varphi\left(c_{\delta,\mu}^{\gamma}\right) = \sum_{\delta\to\lambda} c_{\delta,\mu}^{\nu,d} + c_{\lambda,\mu}^{\nu,d-1}, \tag{6.12}$$

$$\sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma}\sum_{\gamma\to\zeta} \varphi\left(c_{\lambda,\mu}^{\zeta}\right) = \sum_{\zeta\to\nu} c_{\lambda,\mu}^{\zeta,d} + c_{\lambda,\mu}^{\nu^+,d-1}. \tag{6.13}$$

Proof. Apply the equivariant rim hook rule to the recursive formula for $c_{\lambda,\mu}^{\nu,d}$ expressed via Theorem 6.1. Apply Theorem 2.4 directly to the summands, and use Equation (6.2). □

Corollary 6.4. *Fix $\lambda, \mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_{kn}$, and let Γ be the set of partitions in $\mathcal{P}_{k,2n-1}$ which n-rim hook reduce to ν by removing d rim hooks. Then*

$$\varphi\left(\sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma}\sum_{\epsilon\to\overline{\lambda}} c_{\epsilon,\mu}^{\gamma}\right) = \sum_{\delta\to\lambda^-} c_{\delta,\mu}^{\nu,d-1}, \tag{6.14}$$

$$\varphi\left(\sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma}\sum_{\gamma\to\eta} c_{\overline{\lambda},\mu}^{\eta}\right) = \sum_{\nu\to\zeta} c_{\lambda^-,\mu}^{\zeta,d-1} + c_{\lambda^-,\mu}^{\nu^+,d-2}. \tag{6.15}$$

Remark 6.5. As with Proposition 6.2, the identities in this corollary can actually be made more general. In particular, one can replace the pair λ^- and $\overline{\lambda}$ with any pair $\delta \in \mathcal{P}_{kn}$ and ε which reduces to δ by removing a single n-rim hook.

Proof of Corollary 6.4. We can prove Equation (6.14) immediately:

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi\left(\sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma}\sum_{\epsilon\to\overline{\lambda}} c^{\gamma}_{\epsilon,\mu}\right) &= \sum_{\epsilon\to\overline{\lambda}} \varphi\left(\sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma} c^{\gamma}_{\epsilon,\mu}\right)\\ &= \sum_{\delta\to\lambda^-} c^{\nu,d-1}_{\delta,\mu}.\end{aligned}$$

This uses Proposition 6.2 and the bijection between the sets $\{\epsilon \in \mathcal{P}_{k,n+2} \mid \epsilon \to \overline{\lambda}\}$ and $\{\delta \in \mathcal{P}_{kn} \mid \delta \to \lambda^-\}$.

To prove Equation (6.15), apply the recursion in (6.1) to Equation (6.2), obtaining

$$\begin{aligned}&\varphi\left(\frac{1}{\sum_{i\in U(\gamma)} t_i - \sum_{j\in U(\overline{\lambda})} t_j}\left(\sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma}\sum_{\epsilon\to\overline{\lambda}} c^{\gamma}_{\epsilon,\mu} - \sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma}\sum_{\gamma\to\eta} c^{\eta}_{\overline{\lambda},\mu}\right)\right)\\ &= \frac{1}{\sum_{i\in U(\nu)} t_i - \sum_{j\in U(\lambda^-)} t_j}\left(\sum_{\delta\to\lambda^-} c^{\nu,d-1}_{\delta,\mu} - \sum_{\nu\to\zeta} c^{\zeta,d-1}_{\lambda^-,\mu} - c^{\nu^+,d-2}_{\lambda^-,\mu}\right).\end{aligned} \tag{6.16}$$

Note that Equation (4.1) gives us that

$$\varphi\left(\sum_{i\in U(\gamma)} t_i - \sum_{j\in U(\overline{\lambda})} t_j\right) = \sum_{i\in U(\nu)} t_i - \sum_{j\in U(\lambda^-)} t_j, \tag{6.17}$$

which means that the denominators in (6.16) match. Since the denominators in (6.16) are equal, the numerators are as well, from which Equation (6.15) follows. □

Corollary 6.6. *Fix $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_{kn}$, and let Γ be the set of partitions which n-rim hook reduce to ν by removing d rim hooks. Further, let Γ' be the set of partitions which n-rim hook reduce to ν by removing $d-1$ rim hooks. Fix $\delta, \mu \in \mathcal{P}_{kn}$ where $\delta_1 < n-k$, and suppose that ε is a partition which reduces to δ by removing a single n-rim hook. Then*

$$\varphi\left(\sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma} c^{\gamma}_{\varepsilon,\mu}\right) = \varphi\left(\sum_{\gamma'\in\Gamma'} c^{\gamma'}_{\delta,\mu}\right). \tag{6.18}$$

Proof. Applying Proposition 6.2 and Theorem 2.4 in turn,

$$\sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma} \varphi\left(c^{\gamma}_{\varepsilon,\mu}\right) = c^{\nu,d-1}_{\delta,\mu} = \sum_{\gamma'\in\Gamma'} \varphi\left(c^{\gamma'}_{\delta,\mu}\right). \tag{6.19}$$

□

Proposition 6.7. *Let $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{P}_{kn}$. Then*

$$\sum_{\nu,d} c^{\nu,d}_{\lambda,\mu}\left(\sum_{\delta\to\nu}\sigma_\delta + q\sigma_{\nu^-}\right) = \sum_{\substack{\gamma,d\\ \epsilon\to\lambda}} c^{\gamma,d}_{\epsilon,\mu}\sigma_\gamma + q\sum_{\zeta,d} c^{\zeta,d}_{\lambda^-,\mu}\sigma_\zeta \tag{6.20}$$

Proof. This comes from examination of coefficients in the proof of one-box associativity. □

REFERENCES

[AW] S. Agnihotri and C. Woodward. Eigenvalues of products of unitary matrices and quantum Schubert calculus. *Math. Res. Lett.*, 5(6):817–836, 1998.

[BCFF] Aaron Bertram, Ionuţ Ciocan-Fontanine, and William Fulton. Quantum multiplication of Schur polynomials. *J. Algebra*, 219(2):728–746, 1999.

[Bel] Prakash Belkale. Local systems on $\mathbb{P}^1 - S$ for S a finite set. *Compositio Math.*, 129(1):67–86, 2001.

[Ber] Aaron Bertram. Quantum Schubert calculus. *Adv. Math.*, 128(2):289–305, 1997.

[BKPT] Anders Skovsted Buch, Andrew Kresch, Kevin Purbhoo, and Harry Tamvakis. The two step puzzle conjecture.

[BKT] Anders Skovsted Buch, Andrew Kresch, and Harry Tamvakis. Gromov-Witten invariants on Grassmannians. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 16(4):901–915 (electronic), 2003.

[Buc] Anders Skovsted Buch. Mutations of puzzles and equivariant cohomology of two-step flag varieties. preprint in preparation, 2013.

[FP] W. Fulton and R. Pandharipande. Notes on stable maps and quantum cohomology. In *Algebraic geometry—Santa Cruz 1995*, volume 62 of *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.*, pages 45–96. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1997.

[Ful] William Fulton. *Young tableaux*, volume 35 of *London Mathematical Society Student Texts*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997. With applications to representation theory and geometry.

[Giv] Alexander B. Givental. Equivariant Gromov-Witten invariants. *Internat. Math. Res. Notices*, (13):613–663, 1996.

[GK1] Alexander Givental and Bumsig Kim. Quantum cohomology of flag manifolds and Toda lattices. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 168(3):609–641, 1995.

[GK2] Vassily Gorbounov and Christian Korff. Equivariant quantum cohomology and Yang-Baxter algebras, 2014.

[Gra] William Graham. Positivity in equivariant Schubert calculus. *Duke Math. J.*, 109(3):599–614, 2001.

[Hor] Alfred Horn. Eigenvalues of sums of Hermitian matrices. *Pacific J. Math.*, 12:225–241, 1962.

[JK] Gordon James and Adalbert Kerber. *The representation theory of the symmetric group*, volume 16 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Reading, Mass., 1981. With a foreword by P. M. Cohn, With an introduction by Gilbert de B. Robinson.

[KT] Allen Knutson and Terence Tao. Puzzles and (equivariant) cohomology of Grassmannians. *Duke Math. J.*, 119(2):221–260, 2003.

[LS1] Thomas Lam and Mark Shimozono. Quantum cohomology of G/P and homology of affine Grassmannian. *Acta Math.*, 204(1):49–90, 2010.

[LS2] Thomas Lam and Mark Shimozono. From double quantum Schubert polynomials to k-double Schur functions via the Toda lattice, 2011.

[LS3] Thomas Lam and Mark Shimozono. k-double Schur functions and equivariant (co)homology of the affine Grassmannian. *Math. Ann.*, 356(4):1379–1404, 2013.

[Mac] I. G. Macdonald. *Symmetric functions and Hall polynomials*. Oxford Mathematical Monographs. The Clarendon Press Oxford University Press, New York, second edition, 1995. With contributions by A. Zelevinsky, Oxford Science Publications.

[Mih1] Leonardo Mihalcea. Equivariant quantum Schubert calculus. *Adv. Math.*, 203(1):1–33, 2006.

[Mih2] Leonardo Constantin Mihalcea. Giambelli formulae for the equivariant quantum cohomology of the Grassmannian. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 360(5):2285–2301, 2008.

[MS] Alexander I. Molev and Bruce E. Sagan. A Littlewood-Richardson rule for factorial Schur functions. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 351(11):4429–4443, 1999.

[S$^+$] W. A. Stein et al. *Sage Mathematics Software (Version 5.10)*. The Sage Development Team, 2013. `http://www.sagemath.org`.

ELIZABETH BEAZLEY, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS & STATISTICS, HAVERFORD COLLEGE, HAVERFORD, PA, USA

ANNA BERTIGER, DEPARTMENT OF COMBINATORICS AND OPTIMIZATION, UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO, WATERLOO, ON, CANADA

KAISA TAIPALE, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, MINNEAPOLIS, MN, USA

E-mail address: `ebeazley@haverford.edu, abertige@uwaterloo.ca, taipale@math.umn.edu`